

Relativistic covariance and the bound state wave function

L.Micu*

Department of Theoretical Physics

*Horia Hulubei Institute for Physics and Nuclear Engineering
Bucharest POB MG-6, 76900 Romania*

We establish a relation between the solution of a relativistic bound state equation in quantum mechanics and the field representation of a bound state with the aid of creation and annihilation operators. We show that a bound system can be represented by a gas of free constituents and a classical effective field representing the countless quantum fluctuations generating the binding potential. The distribution function of the internal momenta is given by the projection of the free states on the solution of a relativistic bound state equation in the rest frame of the bound system. In this approach Lorentz covariance, mass-shell constraints and single particle normalizability of the bound state function are simultaneously and explicitly satisfied. The discussion is made for a two particle bound state and can be easily generalized to the case of three or more particles.

The bound states of a two particle system found their best description in nonrelativistic quantum mechanics where their existence is conditioned by the presence of an attractive potential well. In this approach the internal dynamics is represented by an unphysical particle with a reduced mass, moving inside the well. The defining features of a bound state function are stationarity and normalizability.

In the relativistic approaches derived from field theory the bound state wave functions do not satisfy these criteria because the binding is supposed a consequence of quantum fluctuations, that is of a continuous exchange of quanta among the constituents [1,2]. The internal dynamics involves an indefinite number of independent particles and the bound state wave function has a fluctuating character. The attempt to improve the situation by restricting the intermediate states to the positive energy ones is artificial and may destroy relativistic covariance [2].

It has been however shown by Dirac [3] that it is possible to quantize a bound system with a fixed number of particles and to satisfy in the same time relativistic covariance by constructing explicitly the interaction dependent generators of the symmetry group. Restraining the symmetry group to those transformations which are purely kinematical it has been possible to develop dynamical models independent on the concrete form of the interaction. This idea stays at the origin of the light cone models extensively used in hadron physics [4]. The full relativistic covariance is of course destroyed in this case, but the effects of symmetry violation may be evaluated by comparing various quantization schemes [5].

Other stationary approaches like, for instance, those based on the relativistic generalization of the time independent Schrödinger equation with an interaction potential yielding a realistic bound state mass spectrum [6] have been used mainly in the study of static effects.

Closing this discussion we notice that the quantum mechanical approach and the field approach can be put in agreement with each other if one finds a way to introduce the independent constituents

*E-mail address: lmicu@theory.nipne.ro

in the quantum mechanical approach and if one assumes that the binding potential is the time averaged result of some fast quantum fluctuations. The main problem remaining to be solved is then to find the relation between the solution of a relativistic bound state equation and the field representation of a bound state in terms of creation and annihilation operators. The clarification of this point is the main purpose of the present paper.

In the following we refer to the meson case as a quark antiquark bound state. The flavor and color indices are omitted for simplicity and the interaction potential is assumed to be white.

We first consider the bound state problem in the meson rest frame. In order to ensure an independent treatment of the quarks we assume that the total Hamiltonian is the sum of two free Dirac Hamiltonians and of an interaction potential which depends on both coordinates. Its eigenfunctions are the internal functions of the bound system in the rest frame and the corresponding eigenvalues are the meson masses. We then have:

$$\left[\sum_{j=1,2} (-i\vec{\nabla}^{(j)} \vec{\alpha}^{(j)} + \beta m_j) + \mathcal{V}_0(\vec{x}_1, \vec{x}_2) \right] \Psi(\vec{x}_1, \vec{x}_2) = M \Psi(\vec{x}_1, \vec{x}_2) \quad (1)$$

where α and β are Dirac matrices and $\mathcal{V}_0$ is the interaction potential. The function $\Psi(\vec{x}_1, \vec{x}_2)$ has two spinorial indices and can be best written under the form of a 4×4 matrix.

We remark that the independent treatment of the quarks entails the violation of translational invariance with respect to the quark coordinates. In order to remove this inconsistency, we introduce a vector-type external field $\vec{\mathcal{V}}(\vec{x}_1, \vec{x}_2)$ which enters the following set of equations

$$(-i\vec{\nabla}^{(1)} - i\vec{\nabla}^{(2)} + \vec{\mathcal{V}}(\vec{x}_1, \vec{x}_2)) \Psi(\vec{x}_1, \vec{x}_2) = 0 \quad (2)$$

completing covariantly the eq.(1). The compatibility between eq.(1) and the eqs.(2) shall be briefly commented in the next in agreement with the interpretation we give to the interaction potential.

The solution in the coordinate representation of eqs.(1) and (2) corresponding to the eigenvalue $M_{\{n\}}$ where $\{n\}$ is a set of quantum numbers labelling the bound state is denoted by $\Psi_{\{n\}}(\vec{x}_1, \vec{x}_2) = \langle \vec{x}_1, \vec{x}_2 | \Psi_{\{n\}} \rangle$. Its projection on the solutions of the free Dirac equation $\psi_{\{\vec{k}_j\}}(\vec{x}_j) = \exp(i\epsilon_j \vec{k}_j \vec{x}_j) w(\{\vec{k}_j\})$ and $\psi^c = C \bar{\psi}_{\{\vec{k}_j\}}^T(\vec{x}_j)$ is denoted by $\bar{w}_i(\{\vec{k}_1\}) \left(\Psi_{\{n\}}(\{\vec{k}_1\}, \{\vec{k}_2\}) \right)_{ij} \bar{w}_j^c(\{\vec{k}_2\})$, where C is the charge conjugation matrix, w is a Dirac spinor, $\{\vec{k}_j\}$ represents the set of quantum numbers $\{\epsilon_j, r_j, \vec{k}_j\}$ labelling the free states ($\epsilon_j = \pm$ is the sign of the energy, r_j is the projection of the spin on an arbitrary axis and $\vec{k}_j$ is the momentum). It is an easy matter to see that the projection satisfies the following set of equations derived from (1) and (2)

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\epsilon_1 \sqrt{\vec{k}_1^2 + m_1^2} + \epsilon_2 \sqrt{\vec{k}_2^2 + m_2^2} \right) \bar{w}(\{\vec{k}_1\}) \Psi_{\{n\}}(\{\vec{k}_1\}, \{\vec{k}_2\}) \bar{w}^c(\{\vec{k}_2\}) + \langle \{\vec{k}_1\}, \{\vec{k}_2\} | \mathcal{V}_0 | \{n\} \rangle \\ & = M_{\{n\}} \bar{w}(\{\vec{k}_1\}) \Psi_{\{n\}}(\{\vec{k}_1\}, \{\vec{k}_2\}) \bar{w}^c(\{\vec{k}_2\}) \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

$$(\epsilon_1 \vec{k}_1 + \epsilon_2 \vec{k}_2) \bar{w}(\{\vec{k}_1\}) \Psi_{\{n\}}(\{\vec{k}_1\}, \{\vec{k}_2\}) w(\{\vec{k}_2\}) + \langle \{\vec{k}_1\}, \{\vec{k}_2\} | \vec{\mathcal{V}} | \{n\} \rangle = 0. \quad (4)$$

We now recall that according to the general principles of quantum mechanics the projection $\bar{w}(\{\vec{k}_1\}) \Psi_{\{n\}}(\{\vec{k}_1\}, \{\vec{k}_2\}) \bar{w}^c(\{\vec{k}_2\})$ is the probability amplitude for finding two free quarks with the individual quantum numbers $\{\vec{k}_1\}$ and $\{\vec{k}_2\}$ in the meson state characterized by $\Psi_{\{n\}}$.

Eqs.(3) and (4) show however that the meson cannot be represented by a superposition of states containing free quarks only, because the sum of the quark 4-momenta does not satisfy the meson mass-shell constraint. In order to have a real representation, the contribution of the interaction potential must be explicitly included into the sum, but the operation must be performed in such a way as to preserve relativistic covariance.

The solution we found to this problem was to introduce a classical field Φ as an additional component of the meson, independent of the valence quarks, carrying the 4-momentum Q^μ [7] defined as the difference between the meson and the quark momenta.

$$Q^0 = M_{\{n\}} - \epsilon_1 \sqrt{\vec{k}_1^2 + m_1^2} - \epsilon_2 \sqrt{\vec{k}_2^2 + m_2^2} \quad (5)$$

$$\vec{Q} = -\epsilon_1 \vec{k}_1 - \epsilon_2 \vec{k}_2. \quad (6)$$

In this way we can represent a meson by a gas of free quarks having the distribution of momenta and spins given by $\bar{w}(\{\vec{k}_1\})\Psi_{\{n\}}(\vec{k}_1, \vec{k}_2)\bar{w}^c(\{\vec{k}_2\})$ and a classical effective field which contributes with its own momentum to the meson. The single meson state is then:

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{M}_{\{n\}}(M_{\{n\}}, 0)\rangle &= \int d^3k_1 \frac{m_1}{e_1} d^3k_2 \frac{m_2}{e_2} d^4Q \delta^{(3)}(\vec{k}_1 + \vec{k}_2 + \vec{Q}) \delta(e_1 + e_2 + Q_0 - M_{\{n\}}) \\ &\times \sum_{s_1, s_2} \bar{u}_{s_1}(\vec{k}_1) \Psi_{\{n\}}(\vec{k}_1, \vec{k}_2) C v_{s_2}(\vec{k}_2) \Phi^*(Q) a_r^\dagger(\vec{k}_1) b_s^\dagger(\vec{k}_2) |0\rangle \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

where $\{n\}$ are the quantum numbers of the meson, $a^\dagger$ and $b^\dagger$ are quark and antiquark creation operators and u, v are free Dirac spinors. $\Phi^\dagger$ is the vacuum-like classical field carrying the momentum Q^μ defined in (5) and (6). It is the collective, time averaged effect of the continuous series of virtual excitations of the quark gluonic field giving rise to the binding. Q^0 is the binding energy and $\vec{Q}$ represents the reaction of the whole mass of virtual particles to the motion of the valence quarks, or, in other words, the effect of the imperfect cancellation of the vector momenta during the quantum fluctuations. One may then say that $\vec{Q}$ is an aleatory variable defined by eq.(6) and the eq.(2) is an identity defining the operator $\vec{V}(\vec{x}_1, \vec{x}_2) = i\vec{\nabla}^{(1)} + i\vec{\nabla}^{(2)}$. Of course, this not a unique choice for $\vec{V}(\vec{x}_1, \vec{x}_2)$, but it is the simplest one guaranteeing the compatibility of eqs.(1) and (2).

Closing this discussion on the signification of V^0 we notice a strong similarity with the bag [8] constraint. Both V^0 and the bag are classical extra components of the bound system and generate the binding effects. We also remark the resemblance between the definition of the momentum Q^μ (see eqs.(5),6) and that of the effective potential in nonrelativistic QCD, which is the remaining part in the effective Lagrangian after separating off the kinetic terms [9,10].

In order to clarify the transformation properties of a meson state (7) with definite momentum and parity we give the most general expressions of $\Psi_{\{n\}}(\{\vec{k}_1\}, \{\vec{k}_2\})$ in some simple cases:

$$\begin{aligned} (\Psi_P C)_{lm} &= \varphi_P \gamma_{lm}^5 \\ (\Psi_V C)_{lm} &= \varepsilon^i \left(\varphi_1^V \gamma_{lm}^i + \sum_{n=1,2} \varphi_{2n}^V k_n^i \delta_{lm} + \sum_{n=1,2} \varphi_{3n}^V [\gamma^i, \gamma^j]_{lm} k_n^j \right) \\ (\Psi_A C)_{lm} &= \varepsilon^i \left(\varphi_1^A \gamma_{lp}^i + \sum_{n=1,2} \varphi_{2n}^A k_n^i \delta_{lp} + \sum_{n=1,2} \varphi_{3n}^A [\gamma^i, \gamma^j]_{lp} k_n^j \right) \gamma_{pm}^5 \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

where P, V, A denote the pseudoscalar, vector and axial mesons respectively, ε are the meson polarization vectors having only spatial components in the rest frame and φ_i are scalar functions of $\vec{k}_1, \vec{k}_2$ whose arguments have been omitted for simplicity.

It follows then that the expression (7) can be written in a Lorentz covariant form by replacing $\vec{k}$ by k_T^μ where $k_T = (0, \vec{k})$ in the rest frame and the scalar product $\vec{k}_i \vec{k}_j$ by $-k_{iT}^\mu k_{jT\mu}$. The change of reference frame amounts to the replacement of k_T by $k_T'^\mu = \Lambda(\vec{\omega})^\mu_\nu k_T^\nu$ and of the Dirac

spinors u, v by $u(\vec{k}') = \Lambda_{sp}(\vec{\omega})u(\vec{k})$ where $\Lambda(\vec{\omega})$, $\Lambda_{sp}(\vec{\omega})$ are respectively the vectorial and spinorial representations of Lorentz transformations from the rest frame to a reference frame moving with the velocity $\vec{\omega}$ with respect to the first one. The result is the expression of the meson state with the energy $E = \frac{M}{\sqrt{1-\vec{\omega}^2}}$ and the momentum $\vec{P} = -\vec{\omega} E$.

It is worthwhile remarking here that owing to the independent treatment of the quarks the generalization of eqs.(1), (2) and (7) to the baryon case amounts simply to the introduction of a third quark contribution according to the general rules of relativistic covariance.

Closing this discussion we mention that only the projection of $\Psi_{\{n\}}$ on the positive energy states appear in the expression (7) because those corresponding to negative energy are associated with the quark and antiquark annihilation operators which gives 0 when acting on the vacuum. In a forthcoming paper we shall show that the negative energy states play an important role in the description of the interaction mechanism between two hadrons.

Now we verify the normalizability of the single meson state (7) by making use of the commutation relations for the free quark operators and of a vacuum expectation value of the effective field ensuring the separate conservation of its 4-momentum:

$$\langle 0 | \Phi(Q) \Phi^+(Q') | 0 \rangle = \frac{1}{V_0 T_0} \int d^4 X e^{i(Q'-Q)_\mu X^\mu} = \frac{(2\pi)^4}{L_0^3 T_0} \delta^{(4)}(Q - Q') \quad (9)$$

where the constant $V_0 T_0$ has been introduced from dimensional reasons. V_0 is the meson volume and T_0 is a time sensibly larger than the time basis involved in the time averaged definition of the effective field.

We notice that $\delta(Q_0 - Q'_0)$ in (9) induces a cumbersome $\delta(E - E')$ in the expression of the norm. In order to avoid it by preserving the manifest Lorentz covariance of eq.(9) we write

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{2\pi}{T_0} \delta(Q_0 - Q'_0) &= \frac{1}{T_0} \int_T dX_0 e^{i(E(P) - E(P'))X_0} \approx \\ &\frac{E}{M_{\{n\}} T_0} \int_{T_0} dY_0 e^{i(M_{\{n\}} - M_{\{n'\}})Y_0} \approx \frac{E}{M_{\{n\}}} \delta_{M_{\{n\}} M_{\{n'\}}} \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

and get immediately:

$$\langle \mathcal{M}_{\{n'\}}(P') | \mathcal{M}_{\{n\}}(P) \rangle = 2E (2\pi)^3 \delta^{(3)}(P - P') \delta_{M_{\{n\}} M_{\{n'\}}} \delta_{\{n\}\{n'\}} \mathcal{J} \quad (11)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{J} &= \frac{1}{2M L_0^3} \int d^3 k_1 \frac{m_1}{e_1} d^3 k_2 \frac{m_2}{e_2} d^4 Q \delta^{(4)}(k_1 + k_2 + Q - P) \\ &\times Tr \left(\frac{\hat{k}_1 + m_1}{2m_1} \Psi_{\{n\}}(k_{1T}, k_{2T}) \frac{\hat{k}_2 + m_2}{2m_2} \bar{\Psi}_{\{n'\}}(k_{1T}, k_{2T}) \right) = 1. \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

In the above relations we have implicitly assumed that $M_{\{n\}}$ and $M_{\{n'\}}$ are discrete eigenvalues of the equation (1) with $|M_{\{n\}} - M_{\{n'\}}| T_0 \gg 1$ so that the integral in (10) vanishes if $M_{\{n\}} \neq M_{\{n'\}}$. We notice that relation (10) allows to eliminate the rather arbitrary time T_0 from the expression of the norm, which is quite remarkable.

As an argument for the introduction of a vector potential in eq. (2) we remark that in its absence i.e. in the case when $Q^\mu = \alpha P^\mu$ the expression of the norm will contain the highly singular factor $\delta(\alpha - \alpha')\delta^{(3)}(0)$.

Relation (11) can be interpreted as an expression of the confinement because it shows that a many particle state (7) can be normalized like a single particle one if the integral $\mathcal{J}$ converges.

In order to complete the picture we still have to see if the bound state function $\Psi_{\{n\}}(\vec{x}_1, \vec{x}_2)$ can be recovered from the field representation (7) of the bound state.

We mention first that the calculations must be performed in the meson rest frame, where the bound state wave function has been defined. We also notice that there are two kinds of degrees of freedom in the field representation: those associated with the quarks and those associated with the effective field. The last ones have no quantum mechanical significance and must be integrated out. Taking into account the stationarity of the meson structure, its wave function must be defined as follows:

$$\tilde{\Psi}_{\{n\}}(\vec{x}_1, \vec{x}_2, t)_{\alpha\beta} = \langle 0 | \int d^3Q \bar{\psi}^c(\vec{x}_2, t)_{\beta} \bar{\psi}(\vec{x}_1, t)_{\alpha} \Phi(\vec{Q}, t) | \mathcal{M}_{\{n\}}(M_{\{n\}}, 0) \rangle \quad (13)$$

where the single meson state is given by (7), ψ is the free quark field, α and β are spinorial indices and

$$\Phi(\vec{Q}, t) = \frac{T_0}{(2\pi)} \int dQ_0 e^{-iQ_0 t} \Phi(\vec{Q}, Q_0). \quad (14)$$

It can be seen by straightforward calculation that the time dependence factorizes out under the form $e^{-iM_{\{n\}}t}$ (see eq.(5)). It also results that $\tilde{\Psi}_{\{n\}}(\vec{x}_1, \vec{x}_2, t)_{\alpha\beta}$ contains that part of the initial function $\Psi_{\{n\}}(\vec{x}_1, \vec{x}_2)$ having nonvanishing projection on the positive energy free states. The part projecting on the negative energy free states is lost, because it does not appear in the definition of the meson state (7).

In conclusion, we established a relation between the field representation of a bound state and the solution of the bound state equation in the rest frame. We have shown that the bound system can be represented by a gas of free particles and a classical field. The momentum distribution function in the gas is given by the projection of the bound state wave function on the free states and the momentum carried by the effective field is defined as the difference between the bound state momentum and the sum of free momenta. We mention that stationarity, Lorentz covariance, mass-shell constraints and single particle normalizability of the bound state function are simultaneously and explicitly satisfied. All these properties have been ensured with the aid of the classical field Φ representing the collective effect of the unobservable quantum fluctuations generating the binding.

The field expression of a bound state (see eq.(7)) has clear transformation properties and can be easily written in any reference frame. This makes it very useful in the calculation of some dynamical quantities like, for instance, the electromagnetic and semileptonic form factors.

Acknowledgments This work was started during author's visit at ITP of the University of Bern in the frame of the Institutional Partnership Program of the Swiss National Science Foundation under Contract No.7 IP 051219. The author thanks Prof. Heiri Leutwyler for hospitality and stimulating discussions.

A careful reading of the manuscript and suggestions of Floarea Stancu as well as clarifying discussions with Irinel Caprini are also gratefully acknowledged.

-
- [1] E. E. Salpeter and H. A. Bethe, Phys. Rev. **84**, 1232 (1951); M. Gell-Mann and F. Low, Phys. Rev. **84**, 350 (1951); N. Nakanishi, Suppl. Prog. Theor. Phys. **43**, 1 (1969).
 - [2] A. A. Logunov and A. N. Tavkhelidze, Nuovo Cim. **29**, 380 (1963); V. G. Kadyshevsky, Nucl. Phys. **B6**, 125 (1968); F. Gross, Phys. Rev. **186**, 1448 (1969); F. Gross and J. Milana, Phys. Rev. D **43**,

- 2401 (1991); R. N. Faustov, V. O. Galkin and A. Yu. Mishurov, Phys. Rev. D **53**, 6302 (1996); R. N. Faustov and V. O. Galkin, Phys. Rev. D **52**, 5131 (1995).
- [3] P. A. M. Dirac, Rev. Mod. Phys. **21**, 392 (1949).
 - [4] H. Leutwyler and J. Stern, Ann. Phys. (N. Y.) **112**, 94 (1978); G. P. Lepage and S. J. Brodsky, Phys. Rev. **D22**, 2157 (1980); P. L. Chung, F. Coester and W. N. Polizou, Phys. Lett. **B 205**, 545 (1988); A. Szczepaniak, Chueng-Ryong Ji and S. R. Cotanch, Phys. Rev. **D49**, 3466 (1994); S. J. Brodsky, hep-ph/0004211,
 - [5] A. Szczepaniak, A. G. Williams, Phys. Rev. **D47**, 1175 (1993).
 - [6] D. P. Stanley and D. Robson, Phys. Rev. D **21**, 3180 (1980); S. Godfrey and N. Isgur, Phys. Rev. D **32**, 189 (1985); N. Isgur, D. Scora, B. Grinstein and M. B. Wise, Phys. Rev. D **39**, 799 (1989); N. Barik, B. K. Dash and M. Das, Phys. Rev. D **31**, 1652 (1985); N. Barik, P. C. Dash, A. R. Panda, Phys. Rev. D **46**, 3856 (1992).
 - [7] D. Ghilencea and L. Micu, Phys. Rev. D **52**, 1577 (1995); L. Micu, Phys. Rev. D **53**, 5318 (1996); *ibidem* D **55**, 4151 (1997).
 - [8] A. Chodos, R. L. Jaffe, K. Johnson, C. B. Thorn and V. F. Weisskopf, Phys. Rev. D **9**, 3471 (1974); A. Chodos, R. L. Jaffe, K. Johnson and C. B. Thorn, Phys. Rev. D **10**, 2599 (1974); T. DeGrand, R. L. Jaffe, K. Johnson and J. Kiskis, Phys. Rev. D **12**, 2060 (1975).
 - [9] N. Brambilla, hep-ph/0008279; G. S. Bali, hep-ph/0010032; N. Brambilla and A. Vairo, Phys. Rev. D **55**, 3974 (1997); N. Brambilla, P. Consoli and G. M. Prosperi, Phys. Rev. D **50**, 5878 (1994).
 - [10] K. G. Wilson, Phys. Rev. D **10**, 2445 (1974); L. S. Brown and W. I. Weisberger, Phys. Rev. D **20**, 3239 (1979).